

Evening Telegraph

A DAILY AFTERNOON NEWSPAPER.

OFFICE NO. 108 S. THIRD STREET.

Price Two Cents per Copy, or TWELVE CENTS per Week, payable to the Carrier, or mailed to Subscribers out of the City at FIVE DOLLARS PER ANNUUM; OVER SEVEN MONTHS, INvariably ADVANCE for two periods.

Advertisements inserted at the usual rates. A liberal arrangement made for insertion interests.

To Correspondents.

We desire our readers to submit their communications to us, and we will do our best to forward them to the name and address of the writer—unless necessarily for publication, not as a personal favor to good friends. We desire to receive no correspondence in all of our editions.

Advertisers.

Order in the great increase in the Circulation of THE DAILY EVENING TELEGRAPH, for every hour, we respectfully request that advertisements may be inserted in as soon as 10 o'clock, if possible, to secure insertion in all of our editions.

SATURDAY, JULY 23, 1864.

THE RESCUE BY THE YACHT DEER-

HORNED.

WHAT DO COURTESY AND INTERNATIONAL

COMITY DICTATE?

The question in regard to the right of Mr. LANCASTER, of the yacht *Deerhomed*, to retain SEMMES and some of his officers, after having rescued them from drowning, has from the very first discussion of the topic, been generally decided in the negative by Americans. It is the impression of Captain WINSLOW and his officers, that the persons carried off by the yacht were rescued in contravention of all rules of courtesy and international comity. But when every loyal American may well scrutinize his judgment in a case where his feelings are necessarily enlisted, it is easy to conceive that in the position in which the officers of the *Kearsarge* find themselves, they are of all men the ones who cannot be regarded in this matter as high authority.

A New York paper took the view that SEMMES, although a prisoner, had a right to use any means at his disposal to escape, but that Mr. LANCASTER was wrong in removing him; and there is evidence adduced to show that Mr. LANCASTER felt himself to be in the wrong. "Indeed, Mr. LANCASTER himself," says he expected, as he was moving away, "to be brought to a shot, plainly indicating to whom, in his opinion at that time, those he had taken on board belonged, and the character of his own act in conveying them away." Now this evidence does not at all afford proof that Mr. LANCASTER knew he was doing an unworthy act. It merely goes to show that Mr. LANCASTER was thinking of the point of view from which Captain WINSLOW would probably regard the aiding the escape of his enemies.

As to the request of Captain WINSLOW to Mr. LANCASTER to pick up the drowning men of the *Alabama*, it has nothing to do with the question. Courtesy could not place Mr. LANCASTER under more obligation to surrender SEMMES than to retain him; for such courtesy to Captain WINSLOW would not be courteous to SEMMES. It is a question of right, and of duty derived from right—not one of courtesy. An infraction of courtesy, superadded to an infraction of right, would aggravate the chief offense; but an infraction of courtesy cannot legitimately enter into the consideration of a question involving the liberty of individuals.

Were the Alabama's officers and men prisoners when they were struggling in the water, or were they not? If they were, Mr. LANCASTER's act in picking them up could not confer liberty upon them. If they were not, then they were free to sail away with any one. As to the motives which actuated Mr. LANCASTER we never had any doubts. All the testimony in the case goes to show that his sympathies were enlisted in favor of the drowning men long before they were drowning men. But with his motives we have nothing to do. The point which we wish to ascertain, is whether he had the right to retain the *Alabama*'s officers and men whom he rescued from the water. The subject being thus divested of irrelevant matter, is susceptible of investigation, with some hope of arriving at a just conclusion.

We think that SEMMES is the culprit, and that Mr. LANCASTER acted as he did in his position of neutral had the right to behave, but as he probably would not have behaved without personal feeling in favor of the *Alabama*.

The *Deerhomed* at sea is just as much a portion of English territory as if she was moored to its shores, or lay there high and dry. To her boats, of course, belonged the same immunities as to herself. If a nation held men in durance on board of a prison-ship, and the ship were to founder, and her crew were to be picked up by a neutral, it could not be justly maintained that such assistance constituted a valid liberation from imprisonment. The men were really prisoners at the time of the foundering. They are temporarily, although unintentionally, in the position of men who have broken bounds. No neutral is under an obligation to save them; but having saved them, they are undoubtedly the rightful possessors of their original captors and jailors.

But had these men of the *Alabama* who took refuge on the *Deerhomed* ever been prisoners? What constituted them prisoners? It was no possession of their persons, for the *Kearsarge* did not obtain them. If Captain WINSLOW had a right in them, it must have been because they were technically prisoners, but not absolutely. The question now arises as to what could make them technically prisoners. It was the act of SEMMES in surrendering his ship. This he did in two ways:—Firstly, by hauling down his flag; secondly, by sending to the *Kearsarge* a boat with an officer who made a formal surrender of the ship. From the very nature of the circumstances, the terms of surrender were unconditional. Unconditional surrender implies the giving up of everything, both personal and material. SEMMES, as commander of the defeated ship, was pledged to such a surrender; hence he had no right to sequester himself, or to allow his subordinates to avail themselves of any means of escape except from drowning.

We have been told that instances have occurred where a ship in a general naval engagement, after having struck her flag, has, on observing a favorable change in the combat, raised it again, and has prosecuted the fight, without having been supposed to act in contravention of honorable procedure. We do not vouch for the accuracy of the statement; but even admitting the propriety of allowing a ship in a general naval engagement to come in again after having surrendered, such a case and the one under consideration are essentially different. In a general engagement, a change that would

enable a ship which had been put hors de combat to resume hostilities, must partake of the character of a rescue. Certainly she could not rightfully go into the fight again if the mercy of her antagonist had enabled her to make repairs which were requisite to enable her to renew the conflict.

But the action between the *Kearsarge* and *Alabama* was a single combat, in which there could be no rescue by interposition of arms. Captain WINSLOW had it in his power to disregard the hauling down of the *Alabama*'s flag, and to continue his firing. The laws of civilized warfare, very justly, do not admit of such an act, but they certainly should give corresponding rights to two combatants. If Captain WINSLOW had it in his power to do what he did not do because his enemy craved no mercy, his enemy's honor was concerned in fulfilling the terms upon which he was spared, and these were unconditional surrender. No number of boats on the ocean could give SEMMES the right to evade the consequences of his act in surrendering his vessel by two established and well-recognized formalities.

We think that it is well that the commander of the *Alabama* was not captured; for then, perhaps, the question would have immediately arisen as to his status—whether he ought to be treated as Rebel prisoners or land are treated, or whether he should be treated as a pirate. As for ourselves, we can not perceive that the status of Rebels on sea should be accounted different from that of Rebels on land. The comparative insignificance of the subordinates in command has not suggested the idea. The fitting retribution for the deeds of the *Alabama* would seem to be her sinking with all on board; but it is almost ingratiate to judge of what would have been better than the event upon which we have so much reason to congratulate ourselves.

THE CONQUERING RACE.
The northern nations of Europe pride themselves upon their superiority in energy and enterprise to those of summer climates. They believe it to be their destiny to dominate the southern portions of that continent, and speak contemptuously of the indolent and effeminate Italians and Turks, and others who seem likely to become the victims of an easy subjugation. In America it is a favorite notion that the indomitable Anglo-Saxons is destined to bear down all before him. Our orators lead us to infer, from their concealed speeches, that energy and hardihood are the peculiar characteristics of the Anglo-Saxon race and the temperate zone, and that, consequently, that race must become the final lords of the world, from whom it is impossible that power should pass.

There is an arrogance of error and a sublimity of egotism upon this subject, both England and the United States, which are truly amazing. All history teaches us that conquering energy is peculiar to neither race or zone. If you go to Constantinople, you will see the Turks passing their days in a kind of lazy dream, smoking, bathing, praying, and sleeping—in continual round of reverie. You will agree with the Czar, that these people are unfit to possess that beautiful land; they must yield place to a more energetic race, which, of course, must come from the North.

But glance at the past, and see the terrible Ottomans sweeping with resistless rapidity to the shores of the Bosphorus, and under the generalship of MAHOMED II subduing the Crescent on the walls of Constantinople; mark their successive conquests in the Mediterranean, when all the combined forces of the great naval states were scarcely sufficient to check their career; and recollect how all Europe trembled before the armies of SOYRMAN the Magnificent. In that age there was no nation in the world to be compared with the Asiatic conquerors in energy and enterprise. Go to Greece, and you will despise those beatiful, yet cringing and indolent men who lounge and steal beneath the shadow of the Acropolis or among the groves of Sparta.

They too, must give way before a more energetic race. Yet they are the descendants of men who conquered all of the world known to their limited geography. Go to Italy and mark the miserable beings who loll along the streets of the Eternal City, or crouch, sullen to hand, among the crags of Aruzzo, to rob and murder the unwary traveller whom they have not the courage to meet in fair combat. They are unworthy to possess that glorious country. They belong to a stock naturally deficient in energy and industry, and the climate has a tendency to enervate them to a still more languorous degree. They must succumb to the hardy men of the North.

It is strange that an intelligent people should be so deceived. No nation, however, has been so bamboozled and befooled. In this matter as in the United States. We present the ridiculous spectacle of a people who, with more of the elements of independence than any other, are more reliant on foreign communities for the necessities and luxuries of life.

With exhaustless quantities of the essentials for manufacturing purposes, we import annually millions of dollars worth of fabrics which our own labor, if properly fostered and applied, could easily produce out of our own abundant resources. Foreign States are thus making that wealth off of our own crude staples which our own laboring population ought to realize, and we are at once robbed of our property and made to pay tribute afterwards to the spoiler.

Is it not obvious that the actual wealth of the United States in specific would be augmented by millions of dollars, if the profits now made by foreign skill and labor bestowed on American raw products were made by our own artisans? We should have the home market which England, France, and Germany now possess, for the fabrics produced in our factories and shops, besides the markets of the world; while the farming and planting interest would have a sturdier demand here for their products, which lose no small part of their value in the act of shipping and transhipping them over half the globe.

COMMERCIAL.

The foreign commerce of a country does not necessarily enrich it. It may consist chiefly or entirely in carrying the products of other nations. In that case it is obvious that the profits of commerce are merely those of transportation. The real source of national wealth is productive labor, and a mercantile marine is only valuable in proportion as it is employed in conveying to the markets of the world what the industry of a people has created. Nor is there any advantage in exporting what we produce, so long as there is a ready demand for it at home. Whenever that is done, a community is not merely forced to supply its necessities by importation, but it loses all that money which is expended in the act of transporting to one side of the globe a huge mass of things which are quite as much needed on the side from which they are shipped.

Hence the commercial exchanges of different independent States, which should, on the principles of a sound political economy, consist in bartering what our people can produce and do not want, is, in fact, made a very different sort of business. It has become the means of laying one country under contribution to another, without the slightest possible benefit to either party, except in so far as the mere intercourse and relations of trade bind nations together in the bonds of amity, and preserve the peace of the world. This is no small matter, certainly. But we think it might be secured, sufficiently for all practical purposes, if commerce were confined to supplying the actual wants of every people out of the surplus resources of others.

This, however, is not enough for the shipowners, the men who live by "carrying coals to New Castle." If they had no more to do than to transport that which is not needed in one region to another where it is not otherwise attainable, they would find their occupation quite gone comparatively. One-half or two-thirds of the commercial navy of the world would rot in idleness. Hence, this class, which has grown to be a most formidable one in wealth and influence, has endeavored to make commerce a principal, instead of a subsidiary and dependent, interest.

The idea that there is a positive advantage in shipping merchandise over the ocean, and shipping it back again, has become so universal and established, that mankind have got to estimate their prosperity by their imports and exports, without considering the enormous loss they sustain in this silly process of selling and buying in distant and dear instead of cheap and near markets, while at the same time they restrict their respective productive powers in order to keep up what they call commercial reciprocity. In other words, we are told that England will not consume our breadstuffs unless we take in return her calicoes and cutlery, and so on; and that, therefore, we must not develop manufacturing art in the United States, because it would close the foreign market for our raw materials. Accordingly, commerce, which is, in truth, the mere servant of industry, has literally subordinated it, so that the interests and energies of the latter are sacrificed to the very agency which could not exist an hour without them.

There is an arrogance of error and a sublimity of egotism upon this subject, both England and the United States, which are truly amazing. All history teaches us that conquering energy is peculiar to neither race or zone. If you go to Constantinople, you will see the Turks passing their days in a kind of lazy dream, smoking, bathing, praying, and sleeping—in continual round of reverie. You will agree with the Czar, that these people are unfit to possess that beautiful land; they must yield place to a more energetic race, which, of course, must come from the North.

But glance at the past, and see the terrible Ottomans sweeping with resistless rapidity to the shores of the Bosphorus, and under the generalship of MAHOMED II subduing the Crescent on the walls of Constantinople; mark their successive conquests in the Mediterranean, when all the combined forces of the great naval states were scarcely sufficient to check their career; and recollect how all Europe trembled before the armies of SOYRMAN the Magnificent. In that age there was no nation in the world to be compared with the Asiatic conquerors in energy and enterprise. Go to Greece, and you will despise those beatiful, yet cringing and indolent men who lounge and steal beneath the shadow of the Acropolis or among the groves of Sparta.

They too, must give way before a more energetic race. Yet they are the descendants of men who conquered all of the world known to their limited geography. Go to Italy and mark the miserable beings who loll along the streets of the Eternal City, or crouch, sullen to hand, among the crags of Aruzzo, to rob and murder the unwary traveller whom they have not the courage to meet in fair combat. They are unworthy to possess that glorious country. They belong to a stock naturally deficient in energy and industry, and the climate has a tendency to enervate them to a still more languorous degree. They must succumb to the hardy men of the North.

It is strange that an intelligent people should be so deceived. No nation, however, has been so bamboozled and befooled. In this matter as in the United States. We present the ridiculous spectacle of a people who, with more of the elements of independence than any other, are more reliant on foreign communities for the necessities and luxuries of life.

With exhaustless quantities of the essentials for manufacturing purposes, we import annually millions of dollars worth of fabrics which our own labor, if properly fostered and applied, could easily produce out of our own abundant resources. Foreign States are thus making that wealth off of our own crude staples which our own laboring population ought to realize, and we are at once robbed of our property and made to pay tribute afterwards to the spoiler.

Is it not obvious that the actual wealth of the United States in specific would be augmented by millions of dollars, if the profits now made by foreign skill and labor bestowed on American raw products were made by our own artisans? We should have the home market which England, France, and Germany now possess, for the fabrics produced in our factories and shops, besides the markets of the world; while the farming and planting interest would have a sturdier demand here for their products, which lose no small part of their value in the act of shipping and transhipping them over half the globe.

The following points are particularly noticeable in the above statements:

First, the great length of time the operation occupies. It is often three years to get a ship built, and during that time the cost of labor increases.

Secondly, the cost of labor, which is the largest item in the expense of building a ship.

Thirdly, the cost of materials, which is the next largest item.

Fourthly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Fifthly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Sixthly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Seventhly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Eighthly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Ninthly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Tenthly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Eleventhly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Twelfthly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Thirteenthly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Fourteenthly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Fifteenthly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Sixteenthly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Seventeenthly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Eighteenthly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Nineteenthly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Twentiethly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Twenty-firstly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Twenty-secondly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Twenty-thirdly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Twenty-fourthly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Twenty-fifthly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Twenty-sixthly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Twenty-seventhly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Twenty-eighthly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Twenty-ninthly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Thirtiethly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Thirtiethly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Thirtiethly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Thirtiethly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Thirtiethly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Thirtiethly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Thirtiethly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Thirtiethly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Thirtiethly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Thirtiethly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Thirtiethly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Thirtiethly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Thirtiethly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.

Thirtiethly, the cost of freight, which is the next largest item.

Thirtiethly, the cost of insurance, which is the smallest item.